

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 31-36, 39-40, 44-46, 48-52, 58 and 60 have been amended. Claims 1-30, 37-38, 47 and 54-57 have been previously cancelled. No new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 31-36, 39-46, 48-53 and 58-60 are now presented for examination. The following remarks are in response to the final Office Action, mailed on August 11, 2006, and the Advisory Action mailed October 25, 2006 thereafter.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-36, 39-41, 44-46, 48-51 and 58-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated over Rajasekharan, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,480,961 (“Rajasekharan”), in view of Xie, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,606,393 (“Xie”).

As an initial matter, in the rejection headings the Examiner has failed to include Abdulihayoglu U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0030784 (“Abdulihayoglu”). However, in the body of the rejection the Examiner relies on Abdulihayoglu. Thus, it is believed by Applicants that Abdulihayoglu was inadvertently omitted by the Examiner from the rejection headings. Accordingly, Applicants will direct their comments to include Abdulihayoglu.

Applicants respectfully submit that Rajasekharan discloses “a method for *secure streaming of digital audio/visual content*. Secure streaming provides *protection against unauthorized use* of digital content.” (Abstract; emphasis provided). Rajasekharan further discloses that the method “checks [a] digital signature, or other source indicator, in the authorization data *to determine whether the authorization data is received from an authorized source*. The digital signature can be, for example, either a Digital Signature Algorithm (DSA)

signature . . . or a Rivest Shamir Adleman (RSA) algorithm.” (col. 4, lines 28-33; emphasis provided).

Xie discloses “a *message authentication* code (“MAC”) that is attached to digital content.” (col. 1, lines 27-29; emphasis provided). Watermarking is an example of a MAC system. A watermark is “*embedded in the media stream*, so that removal of the watermark may destroy or visibly alter the underlying content.” (col. 1, lines 32-38; emphasis provided).

Abdulahayoglu discloses a “method of displaying a feature related to a web-page.” (Abstract). Abdulahayoglu further discloses that a “web-page owner obtains a *digital certificate . . . from a trusted source*. The digital certificate is signed by the trusted source and includes . . . data to provide the logo, company name and actual URL, together with *acceptable payment method logos*.” (page 3, paragraph 84; emphasis provided).

In contrast, claim 31, in pertinent part, recites “embedding the unique validation key in the data stream to form a validation key embedded data stream, wherein the validation key embedded data stream is to ensure that the data stream includes content intended for an associated destination.” (emphasis provided). Applicants submit that Rajasekharan, Xie and Abdulahayoglu all fail to teach or reasonably suggest such a feature. The Examiner in a Final Office Action, mailed August 11, 2006 admits that “*Rajasekharan fails to disclose embedding the validation key in the data stream to form a validation key embedded stream*.” (page 4, lines 2-4; emphasis provided). Instead, the Examiner relies on Xie and Abdulahayoglu as disclosing the feature. However, Abdulahayoglu only discloses a digital certificate that includes URL information, but fails to teach or reasonably suggest any sort of embedding of the digital certificate in a data stream.

Applicants respectfully submit that the watermark in Xie is not the same as the embedded validation key in claim 31. The watermark in Xie is present to maintain the integrity of the content in which it is embedded by destroying the content if the watermark is removed (i.e. to prevent pirating and/or unauthorized modification of the content). Conversely, the embedded validation key in claim 31 is “to ensure that the data stream includes content intended for an associated destination.” (emphasis provided). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 31 and its dependent claims be withdrawn.

Claims 39, 44, 49 and 58 contain limitations similar to those of claims 31. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 39, 44, 49 and 58 and their dependent claims.

Claims 42-43, 52-53 and 55-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajasekharan in view of Xie further in view of Willis, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,738,815 (“Willis”).

Claims 42-43, 52-53 and 55-56 depend from one of independent claims 39 and 49 and thus include all the limitations of the corresponding base claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 42-43, 52-53 and 55-56.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

The Applicants respectfully petitions for a Two-Month Extension of Time to respond to the outstanding Final Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.


Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: November 9, 2006



Aslam A. Jaffery
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980